

REMARKS

Claims 1 and 4-18 are pending. The Examiner's reconsideration of the rejections is respectfully requested in view of the amendments and remarks.

In this Amendment, Applicant has amended Claims 1 and 18 and cancelled Claim 20. Applicant is not conceding that the subject matter encompassed by the claims prior to this Amendment, are not patentable over the art cited by the Examiner. Claims 1 and 18 were amended and Claim 20 was cancelled in this Amendment solely to facilitate expeditious prosecution. Applicant respectfully reserves the right to pursue claims, including the subject matter encompassed by claims 1, 18, and 20 as presented prior to this Amendment and additional claims in one or more continuing applications.

Claims 1, 4-18, and 20 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Lau (Programming by Demonstration: a Machine Learning Approach (2001)). The Examiner stated essentially that Lau teaches or suggests all the limitations of Claims 1, 4-18, and 20.

Claims 1 and 18 claim, *inter alia*, "performing an alignment and generalization of the plurality of steps, wherein the alignment identifies and aligns steps that are equivalent once generalized; determining a procedural model based on the alignment; computing a set of possible alignments and generalizations based on the procedural model; selecting an updated alignment and an updated generalization from the set of possible alignments and generalizations according to an alignment-generalization functional that determines a rate at which the steps of the procedure are correctly predicted for the set possible alignments and generalizations."

Lau teaches a method including translation, learning and recognition phases (see pages 33-

34). Lau does not teach “determining a procedural model based on the alignment; computing a set of possible alignments and generalizations based on the procedural model; selecting an updated alignment and an updated generalization from the set of possible alignments and generalizations” as claimed in Claims 1 and 18. Lau’s method for learning induces high level actions from multiple examples of state changes associated with each action. for predicting what task a user is performing and providing a predetermined wizard to perform the task. Lau’s method for recognition finds a repetitive plan consistent with the induced actions. More generally, Lau abstracts away from the exact sequence of the low-level actions. Lau’s method of abstraction is not analogous to the claimed method; for example, Lau is completely silent on aligning steps. Applicants have amended Claims 1 and 18 to clarify “aligning” and its use in determining a procedure model. Such a procedure model is not generated by Lau; Lau’s generalization is determined directly from the traces (see page 80). Therefore, Lau fails to teach all the limitations of Claims 1 and 18, more particularly, “computing a set of possible alignments and generalizations based on the procedural model.”

Claims 4-12, 15-17 depend from Claim 1. The dependent claims are believed to be allowable for at least the reasons given for Claim 1. Claim 20 has been canceled. Reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.

For the forgoing reasons, the present application, including Claims 1 and 4-18, is believed to be in condition for allowance. The Examiner's early and favorable action is respectfully urged.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: June 20, 2008

By: /Nathaniel T. Wallace/
Nathaniel T. Wallace
Reg. No. 48,909
Attorney for Applicants

F. CHAU & ASSOCIATES, LLC
130 Woodbury Road
Woodbury, New York 11797
TEL: (516) 692-8888
FAX: (516) 692-8889